REMARKS

This paper is in response to the final official action of December 31, 2007, wherein (a) claims 1-9 were pending, and (b) claims 1-9 were finally rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Didriksen WO 00/00300 ("Didriksen").

This paper supplements the "Response to Final Rejection" filed February 29, 2008, and further is in response to the advisory action mailed March 18, 2008, in reply to the applicants' February 29, 2008, response. This paper accompanies a request for continued examination ("RCE") and a petition for a one month extension of time, which are filed herewith.

The rejection is respectfully but strongly traversed. Reconsideration is requested. Claims 1-9 are pending and at issue.

Claims 1 and 9 are amended to recite the new address information being derived from the information read from the mailpiece and applied as a function of the identification code. Support for this amendment may be found in the specification and claims as originally filed. For example, support may be found at least at page 10, paragraphs [0056] – [0057], [0059], [0063], page 11, paragraphs [[0070] – page 12, paragraph [0073] and Fig. 3. No new matter is added.

Claim 1 and new claim 10 recite a step of (or a device for) detecting information present on at least one surface of a mailpiece and applying a machine-readable identification code onto the mailpieces at a sorting station. Support for the amendment to claim 1 and new claim 10 may be found in the specification and claims as originally filed. For example, support may be found at least at page 10, paragraphs [0056] – [0063] and Fig. 3. No new matter is added.

There are distinct differences between the claimed invention and the disclosure of Didriksen.

The examiner has pointed out that Didriksen discloses a method for processing mail pieces comprising the following characteristics:

(b) transmitting detected information and an appertaining identification code to an interface computer (Didriksen pg. 3, lines 25-26; pg. 7, lines 26-30; pg. 25, lines 19-22) and storing the detected information and the appertaining identification code (Didriksen pg. 7, lines 15-20 and 30-33; pg. 25, lines 21-22);

(c) accessing the stored information and the stored identification code (Didriksen pg. 7, lines 15-20 and 30-33; pg. 26, lines 3-5) and determining address information on the basis of the detected and stored information (Didriksen pg. 7, lines 15-20 and 26-30; pg. 8, lines 5-6);

(d) comparing the detected address information with address information present in a database (Didriksen pg. 11, lines 16-27; pg. 25, lines 31-34; pg. 26, lines 1-5); and

(e) associating the detected address information with new address information on the basis of the comparison that has been carried out (Didriksen pg. 11, lines 16-27).

The method according to the invention and the method according to Didriksen both relate to handling of mail pieces.

However, the process of applying an identification code to the mail pieces is significantly different in the claimed invention compared to the disclosure of Didriksen.

Concerning sub-paragraph (a) of claim 1, the examiner refers to page 7, lines 15-20 of Didriksen. This passage in Didriksen discloses that an optically readable identification code is applied **at the departure location**. As a result, the entire transportation process occurs with handling of a label, which is applied at the departure location.

This is significantly different from the claimed invention, which is embodied in a method wherein a sorting station for postal items first detects information present on a surface of the mailpiece (i.e., reads address data) and

applies an identification code in claim 1(a) and subsequently applies new address information as a function of the identification code (i.e., attaches an identification label) in claim 1(g). Thus, the label for further processing the mailpieces is applied at a sorting station after elements (b) through (e) above and after elements (f) and (g) of claim 1.

A further difference is that in the inventive method the new address information (i.e., the identification label) is derived from data read from the mailpiece in a reading process. This combination of reading and applying process further distinguishes the current invention from Didriksen.

The differentiating elements of the method claims referred to above find counterparts in device claim 9.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that Didriksen does not show each and every element of the pending claims, as required to support an anticipation rejection. Therefore, it is submitted that the rejection should be withdrawn and the present claims passed to issue. Such action is solicited.

Should the examiner wish to discuss the foregoing or any matter of form in an effort to advance this application toward allowance, he is urged to telephone the undersigned agent at the indicated number.

April 30, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By /Michael A. Chinlund/

Michael A. Chinlund, Reg. No. 55,064
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP
6300 Sears Tower
233 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357
(312) 474-6300
Agent for Applicant